arXiv:1612.00700v1 [hep-ph] 2 Dec 2016

INR-TH-2016-045

Radiative corrections and instability of large Q-Balls

A. V. Kovtun[*a,b], E. Ya. Nugaev[†a]

[a] *Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Science, 60th October Anniversary prospect 7a, Moscow 117312, Russia*

[b] *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, 9 Institutskiy per., Dolgoprudny, Moscow Region, 141701, Russia*

December 5, 2016

Abstract

We discuss stability of Q-balls interacting with fermions in theory with small coupling constant g. We argue that for configurations with large global $U(1)$-charge Q the problem of classical stability becomes more subtle. For example, in model with flat direction there is maximal value of charge for stable solutions with $Q \sim \frac{1}{g^4}$. We study origin of additional instability and discuss possible ways to avoid it.

1 Introduction

Nontopological solitons (see [1] for review) are extended stationary configurations of fields which can be stable thanks to conserved global charge. Coleman discussed main properties of these lumps in [2] and also referred them as Q-balls. In supersymmetric theories Q-balls may provide [3] an interesting alternative to dark matter particles in the framework of the Affleck-Dine approach to the baryogenesis (see also recent astrophysical constraints in [4]). Q-Balls are also interesting for gravitation waves production in the

[*] **e-mail**: andreykpq@gmail.com
[†] **e-mail**: emin@ms2.inr.ac.ru

early universe [5, 6] and different cosmological scenarios [7, 8]. So, there is a motivation for theoretical studies of nontopological solitons in the presence of other fields in different models of particle physics beyond Standard Model.

The stability issue of nontopological solitons is the most important problem for phenomenology. As was shown in [9], interaction with light fermions results to evaporation of Q-balls. This quantum process is parametrically suppressed for large and classically stable configurations. In this paper we revise classical stability of Q-balls by taking into account radiative corrections due to the fermions. We argue that radiative corrections can provide additional instability as it was presented in [10] for the classical vacuum. For this purpose the model with analytical classical solution will be studied. Remarkably, this model was the first example of Q-balls in relativistic theory [11] and can be applied for theories with flat potential. For large values of scalar field fermionic corrections are negative. However, negative second derivative of the scalar potential is the origin of instability of large Q-balls [12]. This effect may be crucial in phenomenology, where charge values of order $\sim 10^{30}$ are discussed [13].

In the previous works there were studied restrictions on the maximal charge due to the classical fields, see, for example [14, 16, 17]. Here we consider corrections from the effective potential. It should be stressed that stable solution exists in the absence of interaction and perturbation theory on coupling constant is applicable.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we remind general properties of Q-Balls and present the model studied in more details. In Section III one-loop corrections to the scalar potential due to fermions are considered. In Sec. IV we discuss restrictions on large Q-balls and present results of numerical calculations. In Conclusions we summarized restrictions on large charge and consider possible solutions to avoid them.

2 Classical solutions and the model

First of all, let us briefly remind some results from the theory of nontopological solitons. Let us consider complex field ϕ with the action

$$S[\phi, \phi^*] = \int d^4x \, \left(|\partial_\mu \phi|^2 - V(|\phi|) \right), \tag{1}$$

where $V(|\phi|)$ is the scalar potential.

In order to obtain the Q-Ball solution we fix charge

$$Q = -\int d^3x \, i \, \left(\dot{\phi}^* \phi - \phi^* \dot{\phi} \right)$$

and then extremize energy

$$E = \int d^3x \left(|\dot{\phi}|^2 + |\nabla\phi|^2 + V(|\phi|) \right)$$

with respect to this condition. Than, for stationary configuration $\phi(x) = e^{-i\,\omega t}\varphi(\vec{x})$ one can obtain equation of motion which we will consider later. There are several restrictions on the frequency ω and the scalar potential:

$$\min_{\phi\neq 0}\left(\frac{V(|\phi|)}{|\phi|^2}\right) < \omega^2 < m^2 = \left.\frac{d^2V}{d\phi\, d\phi^*}\right|_{\phi=0}. \tag{2}$$

Derivation of these conditions are explained in [2, 18, 19]. For the minimization of energy it is reasonable to consider spherically symmetric configurations

$$\phi(x) = e^{-i\,\omega t} f(r), \tag{3}$$

where $f(r)$ is real nodeless function. Arguments providing that form of ansatz are discussed in [2]. Equations for complex scalar field and conjugated field coincide and we could rewrite them as

$$f''(r) + \frac{2}{r} f'(r) + \omega^2 f(r) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial V(f)}{\partial f} = 0. \tag{4}$$

There are several properties of solutions which can be obtained analytically. Firstly, the useful integral condition

$$\frac{dE}{dQ} = \omega, \tag{5}$$

which has generalization for different type of nontopological solitons. We have mentioned that property because it is crucial for cross-checks, especially for numerical analysis.

Also, there is generalization of criterion [20] of classical stability for relativistic theories [1, 21]:

$$\frac{dQ}{d\omega} \leq 0. \tag{6}$$

We will use the following potential

$$V(|\phi|) = m^2|\phi|^2\theta\left(1 - \frac{|\phi|^2}{v^2}\right) + m^2v^2\theta\left(\frac{|\phi|^2}{v^2} - 1\right), \tag{7}$$

which can be used for theories with flat direction. Moreover, one can consider linear stability of solutions in this model by explicit separation of variables [22]. On the stable branch of solutions $E \sim Q^{3/4}$ and charge could be infinitely large for $\omega \to 0$. Nontrivial interaction with charged two-component

left-hand spinor χ can be introduced by additional Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \chi^\dagger \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \chi - \frac{i\,g}{2}\left(\phi\,\chi^\dagger \sigma^2 \chi^* - h.c.\right), \tag{8}$$

where $\bar{\sigma}^\mu = (1, -\vec{\sigma})$ ($\vec{\sigma}$ are usual Pauli matrices) and g is dimensionless coupling constant. Interaction of the form (8) was considered in [9] and results to the evaporation of Q-balls. Radiative corrections of fermions can turn down scalar potential. In this case [12] for the stable branch there is a possibility to obtain solution with

$$\frac{dQ}{d\omega} = 0 \tag{9}$$

for large values of charge. We will look for such solutions after careful calculation of effective action. Eq. (9) also determines maximal value of charge for classical gauged Q-balls [23, 24], where the origin of instability is usual Coulomb repulsion [14].

During our analysis we fixed the mass m of the scalar field. All dimensional variables are considered with respect to m and mathematically one can put it to be equal to one. We have emphasized above that in the theories with flat direction charge of the Q-Ball might be infinitely large in the limit $\omega \to 0$. In this case time derivative and gradients of the scalar field are additionally suppressed compared to effective potential, which is governed only by small coupling constant g. Also, for flat potential mass of the scalar field is exponentially small for large values of $|\phi|$ and one can take into account only fermionic corrections. Oppositely, we assume that for small moduli ϕ all the physics is governed by scalar field and potential (7) has small corrections.

3 Effective potential

Now, we turn to computation of the effective potential of the scalar field in the presence of fermions. We will use formalism of the background field, see details of this method and a lot of others in [25].

First of all, we devote a few words to the formalism of the effective action. Let us define a generating functional in presence of classical sources $J(x)$ and $J^*(x)$.

$$Z[J, J^*] = e^{i\,W[J,J^*]} = \left\langle 0^+ | 0^- \right\rangle\Big|_{J,J^*} =$$
$$= \int \mathcal{D}\phi\,\mathcal{D}\phi^*\,\mathcal{D}\chi\,\mathcal{D}\chi^*\,e^{i\int d^4x(\mathcal{L}+\phi^* J^* + \phi J)}.$$

By means of Legendre transformation we turn to classical field φ. And the effective potential in this framework is

$$V_{eff}(\varphi,\varphi^*) = -\sum_n \frac{1}{(n!)^2}\widetilde{\Gamma}^{(1,\ldots,2n)}(0,\ldots,0)\,|\varphi|^{2n},$$

where $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{(1,\ldots,2n)}(0,\ldots,0)$ is 1PI Green's function in momentum space multiplied by i. For our purpose we take into account only one loop diagrams.

We can calculate each diagram in momentum space. All of them have no external momenta. That is why we need to count a combinatorial factor which arise from topologically equivalent diagrams with crossed legs. This factor is equal to $(n!)^2/(2n)$. Also minus sign arises from fermion loop and we accounted for all g's from vertices and obtain

$$-i\widetilde{\Gamma}^{(2n)}(0) = -\frac{(n!)^2\,g^{2n}}{2n}\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{i^{2n}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(p_\mu\sigma^\mu p_\nu\bar{\sigma}^\nu)^n}{(p^2+i\,\varepsilon)^{2n}}.$$

The complete expression for the one-loop correction is

$$V_{(1loop)} = i\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{1}{n}\frac{(g^2|\varphi|^2)^n}{(p^2+i\varepsilon)^n} + \\ +C|\varphi|^2 + B|\varphi|^4.$$

We have already included in the expression above all counterterms which are necessary in order to reduce ultraviolet divergences. One could see that the set of integrands is the Taylor series of the logarithm. Thus, $V_{(1loop)}$ takes the form

$$V_{(1loop)} = i\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\ln\left(1-\frac{|g\,\varphi|^2}{p^2+i\varepsilon}\right) + \\ +C|\varphi|^2 + B|\varphi|^4.$$

Then we compute this integral in dimensional regularization. But it is rather awkward to do such procedure by using this method. To avoid difficulties arising from logarithm, we differentiate integrand with respect to g^2 and use

the condition $V_{(1loop)}(\phi, g)\big|_{g=0} = 0$. So, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(1loop)} = \frac{g^d|\varphi|^d}{(4\pi)^2}\,\Gamma(1-\frac{d}{2})\,\frac{2}{d} + \\ +C|\varphi|^2 + B|\varphi|^4 = \\ = \frac{g^d|\varphi|^d}{(4\pi)^2}\,\Gamma(2-\frac{d}{2})\,\frac{2}{d}\,\left(1-\frac{d}{2}\right)^{-1} + \\ +C|\varphi|^2 + B|\varphi|^4 \overset{d=4-\varepsilon}{=} \\ \overset{d=4-\varepsilon}{=} \frac{g^4|\varphi|^4}{32\pi^2}\,\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} - \gamma + \ln(4\pi) + \right. \\ \left. +\frac{3}{2} - \ln\left(g^2|\varphi|^2\right) + O(\varepsilon)\right) + \\ +C|\varphi|^2 + B|\varphi|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Our next goal is to fix renormalisation conditions. We choose them at $M \gg v$ to be of the form

$$\left.\frac{d^2V_{(1loop)}}{d\varphi\, d\varphi^*}\right|_{\varphi=M} = 0 \tag{10}$$

and

$$\left.\frac{d^4V_{(1loop)}}{d\varphi^2\, d\varphi^{*2}}\right|_{\varphi=M} = 0, \tag{11}$$

because we want the scalar field to be massless and with no ϕ^4 interaction far away from flat direction. Then we obtain for effective potential

$$V_{(1loop)} = -\frac{g^4|\varphi|^4}{32\pi^2}\,\left(\ln\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{M^2}\right) - 3\right) - \frac{g^4\,M^2|\varphi|^2}{4\pi^2}. \tag{12}$$

Let us stress that $V_{(1loop)}$ has two local extrema. Firstly, it has the local minimum at

$$\phi = 1.60M. \tag{13}$$

And also it has the local maximum at

$$\phi = 2.59M. \tag{14}$$

If we introduce a new variable $w = \dfrac{\phi}{M}$ we will be able to represent $V_{(1loop)}$ as analytic function which scales as M and depends on the dimensionless

variable w

$$V_{(1loop)}(\phi) = -\frac{g^4|\varphi|^4}{32\pi^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{M^2}\right) - 3\right) - \frac{g^4\,M^2|\varphi|^2}{4\pi^2} =$$

$$= -M^4\left(\frac{g^4\left(\frac{|\phi|}{M}\right)^4}{32\pi^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{M^2}\right) - 3\right) - \frac{g^4\left(\frac{|\varphi|}{M^2}\right)^2}{4\pi^2}\right) =$$

$$= M^4 g^4\left(-\frac{w^4}{32\pi^2}\left(\ln\left(w^2\right) - 3\right) - \frac{w^2}{4\pi^2}\right) =$$

$$= M^4\, g^4\, v_{(1loop)}(w),$$

and dimensionless combination

$$v_{(1loop)} = -\frac{w^4}{32\pi^2}\left(\ln\left(w^2\right) - 3\right) - \frac{w^2}{4\pi^2} \tag{15}$$

does not depend on parameters of the model. Since we expect other loop corrections to be smooth with respect to w, effective potential may be expressed as

$$V_{eff} = M^4 g^4\left(v_{(1loop)} + g^{n_1} v_{(2loop)} + g^{n_2} v_{(3loop)} + ...\right), \qquad 1 < n_1 < n_2 < ... \tag{16}$$

Thus, one can consider only one-loop correction at large φ, because it is possible to make g small enough in order to reduce an influence of higher order corrections. Remarkably, we still can make M as large as we need.

In the end of the section let us look at the full effective potential which is the sum of the potential with flat direction and one-loop correction. It is of the form

$$V_{eff} = m^2|\varphi|^2\theta\left(1 - \frac{|\varphi|^2}{v^2}\right) + m^2v^2\theta\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{v^2} - 1\right) -$$
$$-\frac{g^4|\varphi|^4}{32\pi^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{M^2}\right) - 3\right) - \frac{g^4\,M^2|\varphi|^2}{4\pi^2}. \tag{17}$$

We sketched both potentials. In Fig. 1 one-loop correction is shown and in Fig. 2 is presented effective potential. One could see from Fig. 1 that one-loop correction has two decreasing domains: in the vicinity of zero and when φ is large. It means that we could try to bend flat direction using M by tuning parameters in two regimes:

$$4.2\sqrt{\frac{mv}{M^2}} < g < \sqrt{\frac{2\pi m}{M}}, \tag{18}$$



Figure 1: one-loop-correction for $M = 10$, $g = 0.1$.



Figure 2: Effective potential for $g = 0.1, v = 0.1, m = 0.1, M = 1$

it is shown in Fig. 3 and

$$4.2\sqrt{\frac{mv}{M^2}} > g \tag{19}$$

it is sketched in Fig. 2.

Later we derive them in the section devoted Q-Ball analysis. Also effective potential generically inherits two local extrema except local minimum at the origin. There is one more thing that is worth to be discussed. As we have mentioned it is possible to work in such regime, when flat directions bend because of the first descent near vicinity of origin. But in this case we should care about positiveness of the mass at $\phi = 0$. Because $\frac{d^2V_{(1loop)}}{d\phi\, d\phi^*}$ is negative in this regime and could become larger than m^2 if Mg^2 is very large. When such situation occurs there will be no soliton. We will omit this case and do not consider large corrections due to the fermions for small moduli φ.



Figure 3: Effective potential for $g = 0.1, v = 0.1, m = 1, M = 20.0$

4 Solution for bent flat direction

Now we turn to the discussion of solution. Following the equation of motion of the Q-Ball in our model we obtain

$$f''(r) + \frac{2}{r}f'(r) + \tag{20}$$

$$+\left(\omega^2 - m^2\theta\left(1 - \frac{f^2(r)}{v^2}\right) + \frac{M^2 g^4}{4\pi^2}\right) f(r) + \tag{21}$$

$$+\frac{g^4 f^3(r)}{16\pi^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{f^2(r)}{M^2}\right) - \frac{5}{2}\right) = 0. \tag{22}$$

We solved it numerically by the shooting method although some features can be obtained analytically. We checked that condition (5) holds for each ω for function $E(Q)$. Secondly, we have persuaded that (6) holds because it is crucial for our analysis. And we have made sure that $dQ/d\omega$ becomes equal to zero at the cusp point and then becomes positive.

As shown in Fig. 1 potential has two descents where charge constraint could occur and we continue our analysis considering two regimes.

4.1 First regime

As we have mentioned it is possible to bend flat direction using the first descent of the effective potential. It is sketched in Fig. 3. Here we have to take care about existence condition (2). In order to provide that to be true



Figure 4: Effective potential with different M. The other free constants are g=0.12, v=0.5, m=1.0.

we request

$$\tilde{m}^2 = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2V_{eff}}{d\phi^2}\bigg|_{\phi=0} > 0 \Rightarrow$$
$$\Rightarrow m^2 > \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2V_{(1loop)}}{d\phi^2}\bigg|_{\phi=0} \Rightarrow$$
$$\Rightarrow m^2 > \frac{g^4M^2}{4\pi^2}. \tag{23}$$

for the existence of Q-Balls.

Also we have to get another condition in order not to leave first descent of the potential. Indeed, for particular combination of free parameters solution with maximal charge may appear only in the domain of second descent. For example, M dependence is sketched in Fig. 4 shows V_{eff} with different M, and only one of them, with $M = 30$, has the solution with critical charge lying on the first descent.

When charge constraint occurs in the first descent we could approximate our potential by simple piecewise parabolic potential of the form

$$V_{appr} = m^2\phi^2\theta\left(1 - \frac{\phi^2}{v^2}\right) +$$
$$+(-s^2\phi^2 + (m^2 + s^2)v^2)\theta\left(\frac{\phi^2}{v^2} - 1\right), \tag{24}$$

where $\theta(x)$ is Heaviside theta function and s is the imaginary mass at the descent which embeds appropriate form of nonlinearity that gives rise to the Q-Ball.

Estimations for solution in this potential can be obtained analytically. After all we will compare our approximate results with numerical analysis.

The ansatz of our approximation is

$$\phi(r) = \begin{cases} \phi_0 \dfrac{\sin(\Omega r)}{\Omega r}, & r < \frac{\pi}{\Omega} \\ 0, & r > \frac{\pi}{\Omega} \end{cases} . \tag{25}$$

In this expression $\Omega^2 = \omega^2 + s^2$. We choose this particular form of Ω because the largest part of energy of Q-Ball is inside of radius $R = \pi/\Omega$. The last thing to do is to put $\phi(r)$ in expressions for charge and energy and find conditional minimum with respect to ω. It is easy to proceed because now we have to find only local minimum of the function with a few variables. The energy is

$$E = \frac{2\pi^2\phi_0^2}{\Omega} + (\omega^2 - s^2)\frac{2\pi^2\phi_0^2}{\Omega^3} + \frac{4\pi^4 v^2}{3\Omega^3}(m^2 + s^2), \tag{26}$$

and charge

$$Q = \frac{4\pi^2\omega\phi_0^2}{\omega^3}. \tag{27}$$

The conditional extremum with respect to ω is achieved when

$$Q = \frac{4\pi^4\omega v^2(m^2 + s^2)}{(\omega^2 + s^2)^{3/2}}. \tag{28}$$

and consequently

$$\phi_0 = \pi v\sqrt{\frac{m^2 + s^2}{\omega^2 + s^2}}. \tag{29}$$

It is easy to see from the expression for charge that stability breaks when

$$\omega = \frac{s}{2} \tag{30}$$

and the maximal charge is

$$Q_{\max} = 2\left(\frac{4}{5}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}} \pi^4 \frac{v^2(m^2 + s^2)}{s^4}. \tag{31}$$

The field amplitude in the origin is

$$\phi_{0\ \max} = \frac{2\pi v\sqrt{m^2 + s^2}}{\sqrt{5}s}. \tag{32}$$

Now we are able to obtain first condition in (18). For charge constraint to occur at the first descent two conditions have to be provided. First condition is connected to the statement that the solution with critical charge has

maximum of the value of field before the local minimum of our effective potential (when the first descent ends). And the second condition states that the value of approximate potential at the point $\phi_{0\,\max}$ has to be above the local minimum of the effective potential. Let us express these conditions

$$\begin{cases} -s^2\phi_{0\,\max}^2 + (m^2+s^2)v^2 > V_{eff}(1.6M) \\ \phi_{0\ \max} = \dfrac{2\pi v\sqrt{m^2+s^2}}{\sqrt{5}s} < 1.6M \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

Here $\phi = 1.6M$ is the location of the first minimum of the potential except the minimum at the origin. Also, we assume that $M \gg v$ and for the approximate potential $m^2 \gg s^2$. These inequalities joined with (33) allow us to write

$$g > 4.2\sqrt{\frac{mv}{M^2}}. \tag{34}$$

It is necessary to do one important remark here. We have not showed a connection between s and $\{g, M\}$ (it is important because these are parameters from different models) in our analysis. Thus, it is reasonable to ask whether it is possible that both $M \gg v$ and $m^2 \gg s^2$ are always satisfied. We argue that it holds for critical solution in the vicinity of the first minimum of the potential. If we remember that we have chosen all the parameters are normalized with respect to m then using $M \gg v$ we could take a close look at inequality $\phi_{0\,\max} < 1.6M$. For critical solution it has to turn to equality. Recall that $\phi_{0\ \max} = \dfrac{2\pi v\sqrt{m^2+s^2}}{\sqrt{5}s}$. Since $M \gg v$ we obtain that $m \gg s$. As a result, together with the condition (23) we can finally write (18). It is the final expression which define the range of parameters when charge constraint occurs in the first regime. At the end of consideration we would like to remind you that first inequality in (18) is approximate because we have been used piecewise parabolic approximation of the potential to derive it. The domain which responds these inequalities sketched in Fig. 5. Let us illustrate how this approximations fits numerical computations. In Fig. 6 two curves are plotted. Dotted curve is the numerical dependence of charge with respect to ω and dashed curve is our approximation. One could see that they almost coincide. In Fig. 7 we present how approximation holds for $E(Q)$ dependence. Finally, let us one more time remind the fact that we can tune renormalization scale M to obtain bend potential even for small values of g.



Figure 5: Domain constrained by inequalities (18) at $m = 1$ and $v = 0.1$



Figure 6: Parameters of the numerical solution: $g = 0.1, m = 1, v = 0.1, M = 20$. Parameters of the approximation: $m = 1, v = 0.1, s = 0.03$



Figure 7: Parameters of the numerical solution: $g = 0.1, m = 1, v = 0.1, M = 20$. Parameters of the approximation: $m = 1, v = 0.1, s = 0.03$



Figure 8: This plot shows the effective potential in comparison with the one-loop corrections. Black dot signs the values of the field in the center of Q-Ball and value of the effective potential at the solution with maximal charge. Here $m = 1, v = 0.1, M = 1, g = 0.1$.

4.2 Second regime

In this subsection we consider charge constraint at the second descent where (19) holds. We make one additional assumption that in this case initial bending of the potential is very small compared to the height of the flat direction. It means that bending of flat direction occurs far away from its origin. This situation is plotted in Fig. 4 for dotted curve with $M = 10$. In this case we could rewrite condition (19) as

$$4.2\sqrt{\frac{mv}{M^2}} \gg g.$$

We start discussion of numerical results from the consideration of two cases. First of all, we found some set of free parameters when charge constraint occurs obviously in the domain of validity of one-loop approximation. For example, take a look at Fig. 8. It is clear from this sketch that when charge constraint (9) occurs one-loop correction still rules. Moreover, the local maximum of one-loop correction occurs when $\phi = 2.59\, M$. In this case $M = 10$ and in the local maximum $\phi = 25.91$. Whereas the value of the field at the center of largest Q-Ball in this potential $\phi_0 = 47.48$. It is approximately only twice further than the domain where effective potential bends significantly. This argues in favour of validity of one-loop approximation.

Also, to be orderly enough we show $E(Q)$ at Fig. 9, $\phi_0(Q)$ at Fig. 10.

Next we consider another set of free parameters. We have obtained the solution with $m = 1, v = 0.5, M = 1, g = 0.1$. Plot of the potential is sketched in Fig. 11. Black dot in this plot also shows location of ϕ_0 for solution with maximal charge.



Figure 9: Plot $E(Q)$ when free parameters are $v = 0.5, m = 1, M = 10, g = 0.12$



Figure 10: Plot $\phi_0(Q)$ when free parameters are $v = 0.5, m = 1, M = 10, g = 0.12$



Figure 11: This plot shows the effective potential in comparison with the one-loop corrections. Black dot signs the values of the field in the center of Q-Ball and value of the effective potential at the solution with maximal charge. Here $m = 1, v = 0.5, M = 10, g = 0.12$.

We see that the value of the field at local maximum of the potential is $\phi = 2.59$ and charge constraint occurs when value of the field in the center of Q-Ball is $\phi_0 = 21.85$. It is approximately nine times more than the value of field in local maximum. One could note that it is too far and may leaves the domain of validity of one-loop approximation. However, in this situation charge constraint occurs at very low values of the effective potential. To provide arguments for the justification of our computations recall the expansion (16). As mentioned, potential scales as M^4 and all $v_{(j\,loop)}$ are depend on dimensionless variable. To obtain bent flat potential far away of the origin of the flat direction we could increase M and reduce the influence of fermions by decreasing coupling constant. The only thing we have to concern about is (19) to be hold. Thus, we do not change the values of all $v_{(j\,loop)}$ but make the rescaling and reduce lowest orders in loop expansion.

4.3 Q(g)

Of course it would be interesting to know how large could be the maximal charge for different coupling constant. We ask ourselves about this only in case of second regime. It is more plausible than do the same in the first regime because to consider this dependence we have to make M too large. Let us recall (18). For example, when we choose $m = 1$ and $v = 0.1$ renormalization scale has to be about $M \simeq 100$ then ratio of maximal and minimal g is about 10^{-3}. To make this consideration meaningful enough one needs g to run at least several orders of magnitude. This is the reason why we explored $Q(g)$ only for the second regime.

We have computed maximal charges for wide range of values of coupling constant when $m = 1, v = 0.1, M = 1$. And we obtained

$$Q_{\max} = \frac{2102.7}{g^{3.739}} \tag{35}$$

as it is plotted in Fig. 12 in logarithmic scale. It is easy to see that it almost coincides with similar dependence in case of piecewise parabolic potential where imaginary mass plays role of the additional parameter. For piecewise parabolic potential such dependence looks like $Q_{\max} \simeq \frac{64\pi^2 v^2 (m^2 + s^2)}{5^{2.5} s^4} \sim \frac{1}{s^4}$. It is too hard to derive similar expression for our potential in any framework implying approximation but we could provide some arguments in order to make a little hint.

Obviously, new physics arises when flat direction starts to bend. We expect the maximum value of the field for critical solution to be not too far



Figure 12: Plot $\ln(Q_{max})$ versus coupling constant $v = 0.1, m = 1, M = 0.1$

from this point. That is why we are able to estimate an order of field and size values of Q-Ball by simply finding a point ϕ where potential is equal to zero.

Consider V_{eff} a little bit closer. We remind it here

$$V_{eff} = m^2|\varphi|^2\theta\left(1 - \frac{|\varphi|^2}{v^2}\right) + m^2v^2\theta\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{v^2} - 1\right) - \\ -\frac{g^4|\varphi|^4}{32\pi^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{M^2}\right) - 3\right) - \frac{g^4\,M^2|\varphi|^2}{4\pi^2}.$$

In order to solve equation $V_{eff} = 0$ we have to make a few assumptions because it is impossible to do it analytically. Since we are far away from the origin we can neglect quadratic term of the one-loop correction and also $\theta\left(1 - \frac{|\varphi|^2}{v^2}\right) = 0$ in the domain far away from the starting point of the flat direction. Then our equation becomes

$$V_{eff} = m^2v^2 - \frac{g^4|\varphi|^4}{32\pi^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{M^2}\right) - 3\right) = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\phi = \sqrt[4]{\frac{32\pi^2}{\left(\ln\left(\frac{|\varphi|^2}{M^2}\right) - 3\right)}}\frac{\sqrt{mv}}{g}$$

Also, assuming that logarithmic term is changing slow enough we get that the point where potential is equal to zero is proportional g^{-1} or more accurate

$$\phi|_{V_{eff}=0} \sim \frac{\sqrt{mv}}{g}. \tag{36}$$



Figure 13: Plot $\ln(\phi_{max})$ versus coupling constant $v = 0.1, m = 1, M = 0.1$



Figure 14: Plot $\ln(\omega_{crit})$ versus coupling constant $v = 0.1, m = 1, M = 0.1$

As one can see from the approximate potential (24) if we set $s = 0$ it becomes the potential with flat direction. And the radius of the Q-Ball becomes $R \simeq \frac{\pi}{\omega}$ and $\phi \simeq \frac{\pi v m}{\omega}$. Then we can set

$$\phi|_{V_{eff}=0} = \frac{\pi v m}{\omega} \sim \frac{\sqrt{mv}}{g}$$

and obtain that flat direction ends when

$$\omega \sim g.$$

Thus, since $Q \simeq R^3 \, \phi_0^2 \omega$ then

$$Q_{\max} \sim \frac{1}{g^4}$$

in correspondence with (35).

In addition we plotted $\phi_{0\,\max}$ and $\omega_{\min} \equiv \omega_{crit}$ as functions of coupling constant g in Figures 13,14.

5 Conclusions

In this work we focused on the classical stability of Q-balls in the presence of light fermions. We assumed that scalar field has the flat direction potential which admits stable Q-Balls without interaction. One-loop correction turned down potential for large values of moduli. The magnitude of additional term is negative and has very nonlinear form $-\phi^4 \ln \frac{\phi}{M}$. Then we computed Q-Balls solutions for different values of free parameters. Since effective potential depends on three parameters we studied its distortions under different values of these parameters and found that charge constraint may occur in two regimes. These regimes are ruled by conditions (18) and (19). We calculate $Q(g)$ dependence when other parameters are fixed and found it to be $Q \sim \frac{1}{g^{3.739}}$. Moreover, we derived that $\phi \sim \frac{1}{g^{0.929}}$ and this result is in a good agreement with analytical estimation. We argue that it is possible to avoid difficulties with one-loop calculations because the potential scales as M^4 and in this case it depends on dimensionless variable as we have mentioned in (16).

As a result of our work we demonstrated that interaction with fermions constrains parameters of stable Q-Ball. Thus, one can not neglect this kind of interaction for large charges even if the coupling constant is very small. This effect may be strengthened or weakened because we admit interaction

with other fields. For example, gravitational coupling and electric charge also produce limitation of charge. These effects mentioned in [15, 17, 24, 26]. As we have mentioned in the introduction, model with flat direction potential originally was considered in the framework of MSSM and now has implementations in cosmology. The breaking of supersymmetry may also rise the flat direction and this correction should be also taken into account.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to S. V. Demidov and M. V. Smolyakov for valuable discussions. The work was supported by the grant 16-12-10494 of the Russian Science Foundation.

References

[1] T. D. Lee and Y. Pang, Phys. Rept. **221**, 251 (1992).

[2] S. R. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. B **262**, 263 (1985) Erratum: [Nucl. Phys. B **269**, 744 (1986)].

[3] A. Kusenko and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. **B 418** (1998) 46.

[4] E. Cotner and A. Kusenko, arXiv:1609.00970 [hep-ph].

[5] A. Kusenko and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008) 211301

[6] S. Y. Zhou, JCAP **1506** (2015) no.06, 033

[7] F. Doddato and J. McDonald, JCAP **1307**, 004 (2013)

[8] J. P. Hong, M. Kawasaki and M. Yamada, JCAP **1608**, no. 08, 053 (2016)

[9] A. G. Cohen, S. R. Coleman, H. Georgi and A. Manohar, Nucl. Phys. B **272**, 301 (1986).

[10] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 1888 (1973).

[11] G. Rosen, J. Math. Phys. **9** (1968) 996.

[12] E. Y. Nugaev and M. N. Smolyakov, JHEP **1407**, 009 (2014)

[13] S. Kasuya, M. Kawasaki and T. T. Yanagida, PTEP **2015** (2015) no.5, 053B02

[14] K. M. Lee, J. A. Stein-Schabes, R. Watkins and L. M. Widrow, Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 1665.

[15] T. Multamaki and I. Vilja, Phys. Lett. B **542**, 137 (2002)

[16] N. Sakai and T. Tamaki, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 104008 (2012)

[17] T. Tamaki and N. Sakai, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 044027

[18] M. I. Tsumagari, E. J. Copeland and P. M. Saffin, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 065021 (2008)

[19] M. I. Tsumagari, arXiv:0910.3845 [hep-th].

[20] N. G. Vakhitov, A. A. Kolokolov, Radiophys. Quantum Electron, (1973), Volume 16, Issue 7, pp.783-789

[21] R. Friedberg, T. D. Lee and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D **13** (1976) 2739. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.13.2739

[22] I. E. Gulamov, E. Y. Nugaev and M. N. Smolyakov, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 8, 085043 (2013)

[23] I. E. Gulamov, E. Y. Nugaev and M. N. Smolyakov, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) no.8, 085006 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.085006 [arXiv:1311.0325 [hep-th]].

[24] I. E. Gulamov, E. Y. Nugaev, A. G. Panin and M. N. Smolyakov, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.4, 045011 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.045011 [arXiv:1506.05786 [hep-th]].

[25] M. D. Schwartz, "Quantum Field Theory and the Standard Model," ISBN-9781107034730.

[26] J. P. Hong, M. Kawasaki and M. Yamada, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 6, 063521 (2015)